REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-24, and 26-49 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated October 4, 2007, claims 1, 3-24, and 26-49 were rejected. Applicants are canceling claims 13-14 and 36-37 and amending claims 1, 24, and 47 in this Amendment and Response. Canceled claims 13-14 have been incorporated into claim 1, and canceled claims 36-37 have been incorporated into claim 24. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-16, 18, 20-24, 26-46, 48, and 49 are rejected as being unpatentable over Vleet (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0033803) in view of Rivette (U.S. Patent No. 5,806,079). Claim 17 is rejected as being unpatentable over Vleet in view of Rivette and Fox (U.S. Patent No. 5,765, 172). Claim 19 is rejected as being unpatentable over Vleet in view of Rivette and Darago (U.S. Patent No. 6,170,014). Claim 47 is rejected as being unpatentable over Vleet in view of Rivette, Fox, and Darago. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 incorporates the limitations of claims 13 and 14, reciting a method comprising:

> providing a data store of stored events, wherein the events comprise data describing user interactions with articles, wherein the articles are associated with a plurality of different applications;
> providing an index of the stored events, wherein the index is a part of the data store;
> identifying a desired portion of the data store for replication, the desired portion including articles relevant to a search query and a portion of the index, the identifying comprising:

identifying a first result set of articles relevant to the search query;

identifying frequently occurring terms within the first result set of articles; and

identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms;

replicating the desired portion of the data store; and

storing the replicated portion on a storage medium.

(emphasis added)

As can be seen, the claim recites providing a data store of stored events that includes an index of the stored events. Events comprise data describing user interactions with articles. A desired portion of the data store is identified for replication, and this portion is replicated and stored. The desired portion includes articles relevant to a search query. A first result set of articles relevant to the search query is identified, then frequently occurring terms within that result set are identified, and then a second result set is identified based at least in part on those frequently occurring terms. For example, a search query may be a keyword search for "New York" and "9-11-01" that returns a first result set of articles containing those terms. Additional terms such as "twin towers," "terrorists," and "World Trade Center," may be identified as occurring frequently in this first result set of articles. A second result set of articles can then be found by performing a keyword search on these additional terms.

The claimed invention beneficially enables identifying a desired portion of a data store for replication that includes articles relevant to a search query, where the results of the search query are extended beyond the query. Support in the specification is found, for example, in paragraph [0036]. Claims 24 and 47, as amended, contain language similar to claim 1 and all arguments presented below regarding claim 1 equally apply to claims 24 and 47.

Vleet discloses a system for storing event data reflective of events that occur during browsing sessions of web site users. Rivette discloses a system of manipulating notes linked to data objects and replicating a part of a notes database. However, neither Vleet nor Rivette discloses identifying a desired portion of a data store for replication that includes articles relevant to a search query, where a second set of articles is determined based on frequently occurring terms within a first result set of articles relevant to a search query.

This element, portions of which were previously recited in canceled claims 13 and 14, has been incorporated into claim 1. Examiner cites various portions of Rivette as disclosing the element. Examiner cites Rivette, col. 12, lines 14-27, col. 21, lines 26-29, and col. 24, lines 53-67 as disclosing "identifying frequently occurring terms within the first result set of articles." Rivette, col. 12, lines 14-27 describes notes containing sub-notes that can be linked to various objects. Rivette, col. 21, lines 26-29 describes a user being able to search for objects that are relevant to a project the user is interested in. Rivette, col. 24, lines 53-67 describes searching objects using various search criteria including keyword searches. While these portions of Rivette describe conducting a search for objects that contain certain terms, these portions are not concerned with identifying frequently occurring terms among the *results* of the search.

Examiner cites Rivette, col. 36, lines 21-26 as disclosing "identifying a second result set of articles based at least in part on the frequently occurring terms." This portion mentions that objects are searched iteratively or recursively by traversing links from other objects. However, it does not disclose identifying a second set of objects based on frequently occurring terms found in a first set of objects identified by a search query. As a result, Rivette does not disclose identifying a second result set of articles as in the claimed invention.

Examiner additionally cites Fox and Darago in rejecting claim 47. Fox discloses the use of a checksum to verify the integrity of a replicated database. Darago discloses a system for managing courseware in a shared use operating environment. These references do not remedy the deficiencies of Vleet and Rivette with respect to the arguments above. They are not concerned with identifying a second result set of articles based on frequently occurring terms in a first result set.

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 1, 24, and 47 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejections and withdraw them. As to dependent claims, because claims 3-12, 15-23, 26-35, 38-46, and 48-49 variously depend on claims 1 and 24, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1, 24, and 47 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims. Applicant disagrees with Examiner's contention that the dependent claims are obvious over Vleet and Rivette but asserts that they are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims 1 and 24.

Claim 17 recites "determining a checksum associated with the index and the repository." Examiner additionally cites Fox in rejecting claim 17. Fox does not remedy the deficiencies of the other references for the reasons presented above. Applicants note that similar claim 40 is rejected based only on Vleet and Rivette, neither of which mentions a checksum. Examiner did not cite Fox in rejecting claim 40.

Claim 19 recites that "replicating the structure and content of the desired portion of the data store comprises indicating a read-only status." Examiner additionally cites Darago in rejecting claim 19. Darago does not remedy the deficiencies of the other references for the reasons presented above. Applicants note that similar claim 42 is rejected based only on Vleet

and Rivette, neither of which mentions a read-only status. Examiner did not cite Darago in rejecting claim 42.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above remarks, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with the Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,
MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU

Date: November 29, 2007   By: /Nikhil Iyengar/

Nikhil Iyengar
Registration No. 60,910
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7627
Fax: (650) 938-5200